DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 577 RC 008 758

AUTHOR Deseran, Forrest A.
TITLE When is the Grass Greener? Divergent Perceptions of Community in Three Small Colorado Towns.
INSTITUTION Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge. Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY Cooperative State Research Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO LAES-W-118
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Annual Meetings (San Francisco, California, August 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Adults; Age; *Community Attitudes; Community Characteristics; High School Students; Leisure Time; *Perception; Population Growth; *Rural Population; Social Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Colorado

ABSTRACT

Adolescent and adult evaluative reactions to their community situation were examined in 3 small Colorado towns. Empirical focus was upon delineating specific community aspects which evoke differential perceptions between subgroups within and across community settings. Del Norte, Aspen, and Craig, Colorado were selected as the research sites because each: (1) was relatively small (under 5,000 population) and isolated from larger urban areas, (2) was not economically dependent upon a single source of revenue, (3) was the governmental seat of their respective counties, and (4) had experienced divergent rates of growth in the past decade. Data were obtained in 1971 from surveys of 265 adults and 179 high school students. The junior class from each of the community high schools comprised the adolescent sub-sample, while random sampling procedures provided the adult sub-sample. Some findings were: (1) data indicated strong support for the suggestion that adolescents and adults diverge in their evaluative responses to their community situation; (2) adolescents reacted, overall, substantially less positively toward their present communities than their adult neighbors; (3) students in Del Norte and Craig responded markedly lower in evaluations than did Aspen students. (NQ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RECEIVED
OCT 1 1975

ED111577

WHEN IS THE GRASS GREENER? DIVERGENT PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY IN THREE SMALL COLORADO TOWNS

Forrest A. Deseran

Department of Sociology
Louisiana State University

A paper submitted for the
Rural Sociological Society
Annual Meetings
San Francisco, California, August 1975

The research reported in this paper is one facet of W-118, Economic and Social Significance of Human Migration of the Western Region. W-118 is a Cooperative Regional Project supported by regional research funds, Hatch Act, as amended August 11, 1955.

RC008758

0002

WHEN IS THE GRASS GREENER? DIVERGENT PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY IN THREE SMALL COLORADO TOWNS

Introduction: The Problem

Studies addressing the problem of resident perseptions of community generally focus on the adult populations of target communities. An underlying assumption seems to be that the essential actors of community settings are adult residents and that younger members of communities are dependents not only financially but also in terms of community perceptions. It seems apparent, however, that perceptions of community situation are important from adolescent as well as adult viewpoints. [1]

On a common-sense level we know that adolescent and adult tastes and interests diverge along many points. Styles of dress, recreational preferences, artistic appreciation, and even vocabularies noticeably differ between adults and younger persons within the same social settings. One could argue, therefore, that perceptions of community situation would also be likely to differ along age lines.

On a more abstract level, community theory deals with problems of the perpetuation and maintenance of community over time where community is seen as preceding and persisting beyond individual members. Central to this conceptualization is the socialization process of younger potential community actors, whereby community values and norms are passed from generation to generation. More specifically, it may be argued that the study of community should be concerned with analysis of community formation, maintenance, alteration, and abandonment. [2]

The present emphasis on the divergence of adolescent and adult definitions of community situation is especially relevant to the last three mentioned components of theoretical concern. Maintenance of community involves, among other things, the ability of citizens to perpetuate ongoing patterns and relationships. Such a social process requires the socialization and integration of new members into the existing system and as such depends largely upon mutual definitions of community situation.[3] Divergent perceptions, of course, may not necessarily disrupt community but rather be precursory to alteration of community situation. As old members become less active and influential in the community, new members, with varying viewpoints become major actors (assuming they do not decide to abandon the present community for alternative situations) and through their definitions of community situation transform the community accordingly.

The possibility of abandonment of community is a very practical reason for being concerned with adolescent as well as adult perceptions. Many smaller communities have experienced attrition through outmigration of younger adults intent upon settling in more urban settings.[4] Although much of the literature dealing with the decline of communities emphasizes economic push or pull factors, it is contended here that it is also important to explore younger citizens' definitions of their present community situation.

The purpose of the present paper is to report some of the findings from a study which examines adolescent and adult evaluative reactions to their community situation in three small Colorado towns.

Empirical focus is upon delineating specific community aspects which evoke differential perceptions between subgroups within and across community settings. As such, this research is more exploratory in character than an exercize in hypothesis testing. However, an underlying hypothesis remains implicit throughout, i.e., adult and adolescent definitions of community situation diverge.

The Data

Subjects. Data were obtained in 1971 from surveys of a sample of 265 adults and 179 high school students from three small Colorado towns. The entire junior class from each of the community high schools comprise the adolescent sub-sample, while random sampling procedures provide the adult sub-sample.

Research Site. Del Norte, Aspen, and Craig, Colorado were selected for the present study. Several characteristics of these locations prompted their selection. Each is relatively small, under 5,000 population and isolated from larger urban areas. None of the communities are economically dependent upon a single source of revenue and all are governmental seats of their respective counties. Finally, the three towns have experienced divergent rates of growth in the past decade: Del Norte lost 15.5% of its population, Aspen grew by 118.3%, and Craig remained relatively stable, gaining 5.5% in population.[5] A brief descriptive sketch of each town follows.

Del Norte is located in the San Luis Valley of south central

Colorado about 170 miles from Denver. The town is situated in a high mountain valley area at an elevation of 7,887 feet surrounded by dry sage flats with occasional outcroppings of granite tors. Founded in 1860, Del Norte is one of Colorado's oldest towns and was a rendevous point for freighters hauling supplies from the eastern slope of the Rockies to the mines of the San Juan Mountains. Today, this county seat is largely dependent upon agriculture and tourism as sources of income. Crops of potatoes, barley, lettuce, and wool are produced in the surrounding area. Most of the tourism trade is from those who stop for services (lodging, food, gas) enroute to surrounding attractions, which include the Rio Grande National Forest, the Great Sand Dunes National Monument, and fishing and hunting sites.

The seat of Pitkin County, Aspen is located in the central part of the state about 170 miles from Denver. It sits in a picturesque valley at 7,908 feet surrounded by developed ski slopes. Toward the end of the nineteenth century the town was a mining camp serving productive silver mines in the surrounding mountains. More recently, Aspen has become best known for its recreational and cultural attractions. Many skiers visit the slopes of Aspen Mountain, Buttermilk-Tiehack, and Snowmass during the winter months. In the summer a wide range of cultural and educational activities continues to draw large numbers of people. The Aspen Music School, the American Theatre Institute, the Writer's Workshop, and the Institute for Humanistic Studies are some of the cultural groups which are locally active. In addition to the recreational and cultural setting, it is a fashion-

able permanent residence place for persons of wealth and/or national prominance.

Located in the north western part of Colorado, 213 miles from Denver, Craig is in a terrain of plateaus and messas. The Moffat Railroad, which made the town a western terminus in the early part of the century, played an important role in the community's development, allowing it to become a major shipping point of the state for cattle, sheep, and farm products. Besides agriculture and livestock, Craig's economic base is bolstered by mineral production (oil, natural gas, and coal), recreational activities (fishing and hunting), and tourist through-traffic.

The dependent variable is the evaluative dimension of definitions of community situation. Operationally, the evaluative dimension is determined by respondent scores on a 20-item Community Evaluation Scale (Appendix A).[6] Individual scores based upon responses to "agree," "disagree," and "not sure," are summed and averaged providing a mean community evaluation score. Items are coded from 3 to 1, indicating a favorable, neutral or negative response. Mean scores of groupings of individual means provide aggregate scores where 1.00 is the most negative response while 3.00 is the most positive evaluative response possible.

Findings

Community Evaluation Scale Scores. The data appear to offer strong support for the suggestion that adolescents and adults diverge in their evaluative responses to their community situation. As re-

flected by Table 1, when all communities are viewed together, the student mean community evaluation scale score (1.89) is substantially lower than the adult resident score (2.23), e.g.. adolescents react, overall, substantially less positively toward their present communities than their adult neighbors.

[Table 1 about here]

Viewing the data for each community reveals a modified picture where the differences noted in the pooled sub-samples remain in Del Norte and Craig, but disappear in Aspen (Table 2). Compounding these findings is the observation that there are major differences in evaluative responses between communities among the adult and student sub-samples (Table 3). That is, students in Del Norte and Craig respond markedly lower in evaluations than do Aspen students. The adult responses, on the other hand, show Del Norte subjects as much more negative in community evaluation than either Aspen or Craig adults. This situation suggests two related questions. First, what specific aspects of community are differentially perceived by adults and students in each target community? And second, do these perceptual differences relate to local empirical referents? The remainder of the date analysis will be devoted to these questions.

[Tables 2 and 3 about here]

Differential Evaluations of Specific Community Aspects. As has been discussed in some detail in several studies, scales constructed with the intention of determining levels of community satisfaction can not be unidimensional in nature.[7] Knop and Stewart (1973) present the argument that the value of community satisfaction scales in com-

parative research is dubious, to say the least, in view of the variety of possible existing circumstances in any given community at any given time. What may be a salient issue in community A may not be so important an issue to residents of community B. Likewise, within communities, different life circumstances result in differential perceptions of what aspects of community are relevant to different persons. The point made by these authors is that scales which attempt to provide a single linear measure of community satisfaction are bound to fall short of their objective. With these shortcomings in mind, the following effort remains largely exploratory, using scale items as indicators of specific community elements potentially differentially perceived by residents. What might be considered a weakness of the scale regarding unitary indications of "community satisfaction," may thus on the other hand be considered useful for delineating divergent interests and perceptions, the task to which the discussion now turns.

Table 4 presents the mean scores per item for adults and students in each community with the results of T Tests for differences between means.

[Table 4 about here]

The results presented in Table 4 provide some interesting findings. Perhaps the most important observation is that there is much more divergence between adult and student responses in Aspen than indicated by the mean community evaluation scale scores. The reason the scale scores fail to register any major difference between Aspen adult and student scores is because, unlike the Del Norte or Craig experiences,

those items reflecting marked differences are not consistently positive or negative for either adults or students. Students react more favorably on ten of the twenty items, including four of the ten items resulting in statistically significant variance. Del Norte students, on the other hand, react more favorably than adults on only 5 items, none of which are significant, while Craig students respond more favorably on none of the 20 items.

Thus, it appears as if Aspen student responses do not converge with adult responses when specific scale items are viewed. The fact that Aspen students and adults diverge in an inconsistent evaluative manner accounts for the earlier findings of no difference. The analytical question becomes, why do Aspen adults and students differ in evaluative responses across items when the Del Norte and Craig results reflect consistent negative responses by students? A more precise look at the specific items illiciting the greatest variance in responses may offer some suggestions.

Table 5 has been created by ranking items from the community evaluation scale according to the amount of divergence between adult and student responses. The first rank reflects the largest T value for the difference between mean item scores, the second rank, the next higher T-value, and so on. Only those items illiciting significant differences ($p<.05$) are reported in Table 5. Because of the similarities reflected by the Del Norte and Craig results these two communities will be discussed separately from Aspen.

[Table 5 about here]

Del Norte and Craig. Table 5a further summarizes the data from Craig and Del Norte by allowing comparison of those items which rank highest according to T values.[8] The seven items which result in statistically significant differences between adult and student responses in Del Norte provide the base units of comparison.[9] Also presented in this table (in the last four columns) is the ranking of items according to mean scores for the subgroups within each community. Such ranking, herewith labeled vertical ranking, provides some idea of how the specific items are perceived by the respondents relative to all other items in the scale. Thus, an item assigned a vertical ranking of 1 in the Del Norte student column indicates that the item received the lowest mean score of the twenty scale items responded to by Del Norte students.[10]

[Table 5a about here]

It is immediately evident that there is a great similarity between Del Norte and Craig in the items which rank highest in adult/student divergence. The seven high-ranking items from the Del Norte all fall within the eight highest ranking items from the Craig results, suggesting that specific elements which occur in both communities illicit similar differential evaluative responses between adults and adolescents.

Two general categories of community characteristics are discernable from the seven items listed in Table 5a: first, items dealing with the level of interest associated with living in a community represented by items 15 (interesting place to live) and 19 (recreation

and entertainment);[11] and second, items having to do with what might be called the social climate of the community. Such items refer to the degree of social restrictiveness and cohesiveness perceived in communities (tolerancy, cooperation, consensus, community spirit, and leadership).

The items indicating the level of interest of living in a community appear to be major sources of variation between adults and students. The "interesting place to live" item reflects the greatest differential perceptions for both Del Norte and Craig, while the "recreation and entertainment" item ranks third and seventh respectively in T values. Further evidence of the importance of this factor can be seen in the vertical ranking of these items in the two communities. Adults in both Del Norte and Craig rank item 15 (interesting place to live) high relative to other scale items (ranked 17 and 14) indicating that they find their community situation interesting; while the student responses suggest that these community situations are perceived as quite boring to adolescents (ranked 3 by both subgroups). Concerning recreation opportunities in the two towns, adults respond rather negatively (vertical ranking of 5 for Del Norte and 7 for Craig), with students ranking this item lower than any other item (ranked 1 in both cases). These findings suggest that adolescent and adult definitions of the "boringness" of their community situation vary both relative to how this aspect of community compares with other community qualities and across the age lines. Recreation and entertainment evaluations, although varying across age lines, is seen by both adults and students

in these communities negatively compared with other community characteristics.

It can be argued, based upon these data, that for adults, recreation and entertainment opportunities do not necessarily determine the perceived level of interest associated with living in a particular community. Evidently, a community may be defined as interesting for reasons other than leisure-time activities. For adolescents, on the other hand, there may be an association between perceptions of "boringness" and the availability of recreational or entertainment facilities.

The second general category of community factors which results in divergent perceptions can be characterized as a type of social atmosphere dimension of community. While not so easily classified as items referring to the level of interest associated with living in a community, social atmosphere items include the social relationships and attitudes of members of the community, as opposed to ecological, consumptive, productive, or recreational factors.[12] The items included in this category are:

18. People are strict and straight-laced.
13. People do all they can to help.
17. It is difficult to get people to agree.
4. Community spirit is high.
1. Leaders are doing a good job.

As noted in Table 5a, these items prompt quite similar responses in both communities. The ranking by degree of variance between adults and students (columns 1 and 2, Table 5a) is quite close, as is the vertical ranking by both adults and students.

Thus, for Del Norte and Craig, the data indicates that adolescent and adult definitions diverge substantially regarding social atmosphere. Adolescents from these communities do not define the social situation in the communities as positively as do their adult counterparts. Younger residents tend to see the people of the community as restrictive, uncooperative, lacking in community spirit, and not doing a particularly good job of administering the community affairs, while adults generally have a more positive view of their fellow residents. Combining this with the observation that adolescents also find their communities boring places to live, we get a more precise picture of those elements of community experience which are divergently defined by adults and students. But, as mentioned, the Aspen experience results in a much different set of definitional outcomes. Before drawing too many conclusions from Craig and Del Norte findings, we must take a closer look at what occurs in Aspen.

Aspen. As already made clear, the Aspen results do not coincide with those of Del Norte and Craig. Table 5b summarizes the Aspen results for items reflecting statistically significant differences ($p<.05$) between adult and student mean scores, including the vertical ranking of these items for adults and students.

[Table 5b about here]

The Aspen results reveal that four of the ten items are scored higher by students. The items do not fall into readily categorizable subsets, and, with the exception of definitions of the level of

interest associated with living in the community discussed earlier, there is little resemblance to the results for Craig and Del Norte.

Categorization of items, even when the direction of the differential results is taken into consideration, proves to be problematic.[13] Unlike Del Norte and Craig results, differences between adult and student subjects cut across a variety of types of items. The one conclusion which can be drawn from the data, however, is that the variation noted between adults and students is largely a function of adult fluxuations on specific items, while student responses remain relatively consistant across items. However, the original contention that adults and students would differ in perceptions of community is still supported by the data.

Discussion

The forgoing findings suggest that adults and adolescents tend to differentially react to certain aspects of their community situation. However, it is also evident that age as a factor in itself is insufficient to predict the general evaluative direction of responses. Although two of the target communities reflected definite negative student reactions compared to adult responses, the Aspen subjects displayed, overall, a rather closely matched outcome. Such findings lead to questions of what community factors impinge upon the particular subgroup evaluative responses. That is, are there characteristics of these towns which may help explain the differences noted in the data? Although one could suggest any number of poten-

tial influencing aspects of these communities, three setting factors[14] are pursued in some detail as possible underlying sources of evaluative divergence: recreation and entertainment opportunities, age structure, and growth rates of the target towns.

Recreation and entertainment. As noted, a major source of variation between adult and student perceptions relates to recreational and entertainment opportunities. In each community adults respond to this item much more positively than do the students, although differences amoung adult responses between communities is also evident (Table 4). Of the adults, those from Aspen react most favorably to this item and Aspen students, although scoring lower than Aspen adults, still evaluate recreational and entertainment aspects of their community higher than either adults or students from the other two communities. This is not surprising. Aspen, as portrayed earlier, is both a recreational and a cultural center. The fact that the adult population in Aspen has a higher than average number of years of schooling (14.4: as compared to 12.1 for Del Norte, and 12.2 for Craig)[15] suggests why the cultural aspects of the community are appealing, while the younger age structure suggests why the skiing and outdoor related activities might be popular.[16] Despite the importance of recreational and entertainment aspects of community, the observation that Craig adults evaluate their community situation positively in most respects indicates that this is not necessarily always a major concern to adult citizens.

Age structure. It can be argued that the distribution of individual attributes (such as age) in a collectivity may have an effect

on the behaviors of those who possess these attributes.[17] Age distribution in a community, then, may have a differential impact on members according to their age. With this in mind, the age structure as derived from census data for each community indicates that Del Norte is characterized by larger families (given the greater percentage in the under 18 category) and more persons of retirement age than is the case for the other communities (Table 6). Aspen, on the other hand, is largely comprised of working age members (70.4%) with relatively few older citizens (3.2%) and fewer children than either of the other communities.

[Table 6 about here]

Adults in Aspen are relatively young (median age is 26.4) in comparison to Del Norte and Craig adults (with median ages of 28.0 and 29.3). Also, as has been shown elsewhere, the younger adults in Aspen are more positive in their evaluations than the older adults.[18] Thus, it is possible that the youth of Aspen identify with the younger adults in the community, sharing their positive community definitions. The Del Norte experience, on the other hand, is characterized by a population with fewer young adults, many of whom are unhappy with the community situation, perhaps contributing to the negative student responses. The development of such an argument loses strength, however, with the Craig results. Here we find that despite the fact that young adults react positively to their community compared to Del Norte young adults, the Craig student subjects respond even more negatively than Del Norte student subjects.

It is still possible, however, that age structure may affect adolescent definitions independently of adult perceptions. The existance of a relatively young adult population, as in Aspen, conceivably could be responsible in part for a more favorable social situation for adolescents than would be older age distribution, as in Del Norte and Craig.

Growth rates. The final setting factor to be considered in relation to adult and student variations in evaluation of their communities is the rate and direction of population change. We recall that Del Norte is characterized by a declining population, Craig a relatively stable population, and Aspen a rapidly growing population. Because of the differences in other variables, especially those unique aspects of Aspen addressed under the topic of recreation and entertainment, it is difficult to draw inferences about the impact of growth or decline by comparing these communities. However, the impact of growth rates upon other dimensions of the community which in turn may affect evaluations of the community are more easily discernable.

The most obvious impact is on the age distribution already discussed. Rapid growth, as in Aspen, is characterized by inmigration of the younger, more mobile persons, skewing the age structure toward a predominance of younger citizens. Rapidly declining communities are characterized by the outmigration of the younger citizens, leaving the older and less mobile people in the communities. And as mentioned, the resulting age structure may be considered as an element of the evaluation processes of residents.

The inevitable issue emerges, however, of the direction of the relationship between growth and evaluations. Do residents leave or stay because of their evaluative perceptions or do evaluations arise as a function of the growth or decline patterns? The present data is insufficient to empirically pursue this line of questioning, but it seems likely that the relationship is in both directions. That is, population growth or decline is probably at the same time a function of and influence on individual perceptions. Such assertions, however, remain to be explored further.

Although the findings of this study raise more questions than they answer, a central observation becomes discernable: community researchers need to take into account both the objective nature of community circumstances and the subjective definitions of actors. Regardless of the sophistication of our techniques for delineating various structural components of community settings, knowledge of the perceptions of those living in these settings is of equal importance. Structural dimensions do not in themselves insure prediction of the direction or content of perceptions of residents, rather such dimensions provide social scientists with suspected points of variance between definitions of community situation.

End Notes

1. Although there has been considerable attention paid to adolescent aspirations (for example, Grigg and Middleton, 1960; Lane, 1968, Sewell and Orenstein, 1965; Campbell and Alexander, 1965; and Boyle, 1966), such studies are not concerned with perceptions of community situations.

2. See Knop (1975) for a discussion of the conceptual problems associated with the concept of community.

3. Mutuality is referred to in terms of evaluation of community situation as a whole and does not mean to imply the need to agree on specific issues. Indeed, it can be argued that divergent interests cutting across a variety of issues lead to a more stable "maintenance" situation than an overlapping convergence of views on issues which may become entrenched and unamendable to change.

4. See, for example, Simon and Gagnon (1969), Fuguitt (1971), or Beale (1969, 1972, 1974).

5. The possible relationship between growth and evaluations of community will be in some detail later in this paper.

6. The term Community Evaluation Scale is the author's, although the scale itself evolved from community satisfaction research efforts (Davies, 1945; Schulze, et al., 1963; Jesser, 1967) and is generally referred to as a Community Satisfaction Scale. The emphasis on evaluation rather than "satisfaction" in the present research prompted the decision for the label.

7. Rojeck et al. (1975) offers a recent review of some of the methodological and conceptual problems associated with community satisfaction scales. See also Knop and Stewart (1973).

8. The magnitude of T-values indicate the degree but not the direction of differential response. Because the Del Norte and Craig results for students and adults are characterized by unidirectional responses (i.e., students score consistently lower than adults) this is not a problem in interpretation. Direction will be treated more explicitly with the Aspen data.

9. Because the Craig results show statistically significant differences on 17 of the 20 items, it was decided to focus on only the most extremely differentiated items. As will be shown, the seven statistically significant items from the Del Norte results correspond to the most divergent responses from Craig, indicating that these items are of specific importance for further scrutiny.

10. Ranking items according to mean scores is useful for assessing how subgroups within each community view separate scale items relative to the other scale items. As a device for comparing results across situations, the reader must beware of inferring that similar rankings mean equivalent responses. For instance, if student results show a vertical ranking of 1 for the same item across the three communities it is possible that the actual scores could be quite widely dispersed. What such a result would indicate is that students in each community perceive that particular item less favorably than the other items of the scale. Whether students from Community A are more or less favorable toward that community aspect than students from Community B cannot be discerned.

11. Items are referred to by general descriptive labels rather than the exact wording used in questionnaire items (Appendix A) as a matter of literary convenience. Item 15, for example, is "This is a

pretty boring place to live" on the actual scale, but for labeling purposes is termed "interesting place to live." Item 18 is "People here are generally too strict and 'straight-laced'" in the scale but is labeled "tolerancy of people" throughout the discussion.

12. Although there are other items which could be labeled "social atmosphere" aspects of community (Items 6, 7, 9, and 10) which do not result in statistically significant differentiation between adults and students in Del Norte and Craig, what is more important is the fact that none of the eight items related to economic or convenience aspects of community (Items 2, 3, 5, 8, 11, 14, and 20) are among the top ranked T-values.

13. The direction of differential results has been derived by calculating the deviation of each item mean score from subgroup grand mean scores (Deseran, 1975).

14. Setting factors refer to properties of locations to which all members are exposed, i.e. historical, cultural, physical, or ecological dimensions.

15. Figures are based upon the median school years completed for persons 25 years and older, U.S. Bureau of the Census (1970).

16. Aspen adult responses to the recreation and entertainment item by age group indicate that the most positive group is the 35-44 age group with older groups being progressively less positive:

Age	Item Mean Scores
under 34	2.72
35-44	3.00
45-54	2.39
55-64	2.10
65+	1.67

17. Blau (1960) argues that individuals with a certain attribute may manifest different behaviors as a function of the distribution of the attribute in the collectivity.

18. The research project from which the present paper is taken explores age differences in adults as sources of evaluative differentiation (Deseran, 1975).

Bibliography

Beale, Calvin
1969 "Natural decrease of population: the current and prospective status of an emergent American phenomenon". Demography 6: 91-99.

1972 "Rural and nonmetropolitan population trends of significance to national population policy. Pp. 668-677 in Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, Research Reports, Vol. 5.

1974 "Rural development: population and settlement prospects." Soil and Water Conservation 29 (January-February): 23-27.

Blau, Peter M.
1960 "Structural effects." American Sociological Review 25 (April): 178-193.

Boyle, Richard P.
1966 "The effect of high school on students' aspirations." American Journal of Sociology 71 (May): 628-639.

Campbell, Ernest Q. and C. Norman Alexander
1965 "Structural effects and interpersonal relationships." American Journal of Sociology 71: 284-289.

Davies, Vernon
1945 "Development of a scale to rate attitude of community satisfaction." Rural Sociology 10 (September): 246-255.

Deseran, Forrest A.
1975 Definitions of community: a comparative study. Unpublished dissertation, Colorado State University.

Fuguitt, Glenn
1971 "The places left behind: population trends and policy for rural America." Rural Sociology 36 (December): 49-70.

Grigg, Charles M. and Russell Middleton
1960 "Community of orientation and occupational aspirations of ninth grade students." Social Forces 38 (May): 303-308.

Jesser, Clinton J.
1967 "Community satisfaction patterns of professionals in rural areas." Rural Sociology 32 (March): 56-59.

Knop, Edward
1975 "Theoretical perspectives on community process and form." Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal (in press).

_____ and Kenneth Stewart
1973 "Community satisfaction: conceptual and methodological problems." Paper presented at the Rocky Mountain Social Science Association Annual Meetings, Laramie, Wyoming.

Lane, Angela
1968 "Occupational mobility in six cities." American Sociological Review 33 (October): 740-749.

Rojek, Dean, Frank Clemente, and Gene Summers
1975 "Community satisfaction: a study of contentment with local services." Rural Sociology 40: 177-192.

Schulze, Rolf, Jay Artis, and J. Allan Beegle
1963 "The measurement of community satisfaction and the decision to migrate." Rural Sociology 28 (September): 279-283.

Sewell, William and Alan M. Orenstein
1965 "Community of residence and occupational choice." American Journal of Sociology 70 (March): 551-563.

Simon, William and John H. Gagnon
1969 "The decline and fall of the small town." Pp. 497-510 in R.M. French (ed.), The Community. Illinois: Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Apoendix A

Community Evaluation Scale

SOME OF YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT THIS TOWN: Please check whether you AGREE or DISAGREE with each of the following:

		Agree	Not Sure	Dis-Agree
1.	Local leaders generally seem to be doing a good job of running this community	____	____	____
2.	The teachers here are every bit as good as teachers anyplace	____	____	____
3.	It costs too much to live here for what you get	____	____	____
4.	The "spirit" of this community is unusually high	____	____	____
5.	It is too difficult to get things repaired adequately here	____	____	____
6.	Those people who work hard for the community do not get the recognition they deserve	____	____	____
7.	People here are generally not very friendly	____	____	____
8.	Medical care is very good in this town	____	____	____
9.	This is a very wholesome place for raising children	____	____	____
10.	People here tend to dislike anything of a progressive nature	____	____	____
11.	Taxes are very reasonable here for what you get in services	____	____	____
12.	When community decisions are made, only the opinions of a few people seem to count	____	____	____
13.	Most people here will do all they can to help you when you need it	____	____	____
14.	People around here have to do without adequate shopping facilities	____	____	____
15.	This is a pretty boring place to live	____	____	____
16.	Decent jobs are almost impossible to find here	____	____	____
17.	It is difficult to get people here to agree on anything	____	____	____
18.	People here are generally too strict and "straight-laced"	____	____	____
19.	Recreation and entertainment opportunities are very good here	____	____	____
20.	The services the town provides (police, schools, etc.) are generally very adequate	____	____	____

TABLE 1

T-Test for the Difference Between Community Evaluation Scale Mean Scores for Adults and Students in All Communities

	Adults	Students
$\bar{X}$	2.23	1.89
N	265	179

$t = 8.56$, $p < .000$

TABLE 2

T-Tests for the Differences Between Community Evaluation Scale Mean Scores for Adults and Students in Each Community

	Del Norte		Aspen		Craig	
	Adult	Student	Adult	Student	Adult	Student
$\bar{X}$	2.10	1.80	2.26	2.23	2.28	1.72
N	71	35	74	54	120	90
	$t = 3.97$, $p < .000$		$t = .52$, $p < .603$		$t = 10.23$, $p < .000$	

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance (Using Scheffe Procedure*) of Adult and Student Community Evaluation Scale Mean Scores Among Communities

	Community	$\bar{X}$	N	F,P	*Homogeneous Subsets (α = .05)
Adult	Del Norte	2.10	71	F=4.912	1. Del Norte
	Aspen	2.26	74	P <.008	2. Craig, Aspen
	Craig	2.28	121		
Student	Del Norte	1.80	35	F=38.949	1. Craig, Del Norte
	Aspen	2.23	54	P <.000	2. Aspen
	Craig	1.72	90		

TABLE 4

T-Tests for Differences Between Mean Scale Item Scores for Adults and Students for Each Community

Community Evaluation Scale Items	Del Norte			Aspen			Craig		
	Adult $\bar{X}$	Stdnt $\bar{X}$	t	Adult $\bar{X}$	Stdnt $\bar{X}$	t	Adult $\bar{X}$	Stdnt $\bar{X}$	t
1. Community leadership	2.20	1.86	2.02*	2.26	2.06	1.52	2.42	1.74	6.54***
2. Teachers	2.44	2.23	1.28	2.41	2.63	-1.67	2.44	2.19	2.26*
3. Cost of living	2.07	1.77	1.60	1.96	1.69	1.72	2.12	1.73	3.24***
4. Community spirit	1.93	1.54	2.55*	2.49	2.28	1.47	2.30	1.56	7.13***
5. Repair services	1.56	1.57	-.05	1.51	1.78	-1.83	1.94	1.74	1.63
6. Recognition of work	1.80	1.66	.88	1.85	2.22	-2.47*	1.94	1.79	1.34
7. Friendliness of people	2.61	2.66	-.34	2.80	2.74	.53	2.58	2.26	2.88**
8. Medical care	2.58	2.37	1.24	2.70	2.43	2.31*	2.48	2.20	2.46*
9. Atmosphere for children	2.75	2.63	.86	2.23	2.28	-.32	2.69	2.03	6.66***
10. Progressive attitudes	1.68	1.63	.31	2.35	1.98	2.42*	1.96	1.50	4.07***
11. Taxes	1.79	1.86	-.46	1.95	1.61	2.53*	1.93	1.82	.99
12. Democratic decisions	1.51	1.29	1.70	1.68	2.24	-3.89***	1.83	1.39	4.29***
13. Helpfulness of people	2.52	1.94	3.30**	2.55	2.15	2.90**	2.66	1.81	8.56***
14. Shopping facilities	1.63	1.71	-.47	1.78	2.13	-2.03*	2.00	1.62	3.16**
15. Interesting place to live	2.56	1.51	6.33***	2.81	2.46	2.80**	2.53	1.41	10.60***
16. Jobs	1.44	1.54	-.63	1.69	2.15	-3.09**	1.84	1.54	2.68**
17. Agreement on issues	2.10	1.63	3.07**	1.80	1.93	-.83	2.22	1.60	5.93***
18. Tolerancy of people	2.46	1.54	5.88***	2.81	2.85	-.47	2.62	1.64	9.91***
19. Recreation and entertainment	1.65	1.06	4.04***	2.57	2.24	2.10*	2.02	1.31	6.23***
20. Town services	2.46	2.29	1.03	2.51	2.59	-.58	2.61	2.09	4.99***

* $p < .05$ Two-Tailed Probability
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

TABLE 5

Scale Items Ranked by T-Score for Differences Between Adult and Student Mean Item Scores for Each Community

	Del Norte		Aspen		Craig	
Rank	Scale Item	t-score	Scale Item	t-score	Scale Item	t-score
1	15. Interesting place to live	6.33***	12. Democratic decisions	-3.89***	15. Interesting place to live	10.60***
2	18. Tolerancy of people	5.88***	16. Jobs	-3.09**	18. Tolerancy of people	9.91***
3	19. Recreation and entertainment	4.04***	13. Helpfulness of people	2.90**	13. Helpfulness of people	8.56***
4	13. Helpfulness of people	3.30	15. Interesting place to live	2.80**	4. Community spirit	7.13***
5	17. Agreement on issues	3.07**	11. Taxes	2.53*	9. Atmosphere for children	6.66***
6	4. Community spirit	2.55*	6. Recognition of work	-2.47*	1. Community leadership	6.54***
7	1. Community leadership	2.02*	10. Progressive attitudes	2.42*	19. Recreation and entertainment	6.23***
8			8. Medical care	2.31*	17. Agreement on issues	5.93***
9			19. Recreation and entertainment	2.10*	20. Town services	4.99***
10			14. Shopping facilities	-2.03*	12. Democratic decisions	4.29***
11					10. Progressive attitudes	4.07***
12					3. Cost of living	3.24***
13					14. Shopping facilities	3.16***
14					7. Friendliness of people	2.88**
15					16. Jobs	2.68**
16					8. Medical care	2.46*
17					2. Teachers	2.26*

* p < .05 Two-Tailed Probability
** p < .01
*** p < .001

0031

TABLE 5a

T-Value Ranking and Vertical Ranking of Scale Items Resulting in the Greatest Difference in Mean Item Scores for Adults and Students in Del Norte and Craig

Scale Items	Ranking by T-Value		Vertical Ranking by Mean Scores			
			Del Norte		Craig	
	Del Norte	Craig	Adult	Student	Adult	Student
15. Interesting place to live	1	1	17	3	14	3
18. Tolerancy of people	2	2	14	6*	16	9
19. Recreation and Entertainment	3	7	5	1	7	1
13. Helpfulness of people	4	3	16	15	19	13
17. Agreement on issues	5	8	11	6*	9	7
4. Community Spirit	6	4	9	4	10	6
1. Community leadership	7	6	12	10	11	11

*Tied ranks

TABLE 5b

T-Value Ranking and Vertical Ranking of Scale Items Resulting in the Greatest Differences in Mean Item Scores for Adults and Students in Aspen

Item	T-Value Rank	Vertical Ranking	
		Adults	Students
12. Democratic Decisions	1*	2	11**
16. Jobs	2*	3	9
13. Helpfulness of people	3	15	8
15. Interesting place to live	4	19	14
11. Taxes	5	7	1
6. Recognition of work	6*	6	10
10. Progressive attitudes	7	11	5
8. Medical care	8	17	13
19. Recreation and entertainment	9	16	11**
14. Shopping facilities	10*	4	7

*Student mean score higher than adult mean score

**Tied ranks

TABLE 6

Percent of Persons by Age Group for Each Community and the State

	Del Norte	Aspen	Craig	The State
Under 18	36.8	26.4	29.3	35.1
18-64	49.1	70.4	59.5	56.4
65+	14.1	3.2	11.2	8.5
Median Age	28.0	26.4	29.3	